

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of March 26, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action of March 26, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,247); rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. in view of Barshinger (U.S. Patent No. 5,049,864); and objected to claims 4 and 5 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4 and 5; however, the applied rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chang et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is patentable over Chang et al. in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a liquid crystal display panel having a display standard; an interface receiving a timing data... and a control signal corresponding to the display standard; a timing controller... for generating and outputting timing signals for driving the liquid crystal display panel based on the control signal... wherein said timing controller includes a decoder and a timing generator, wherein timing generation information corresponding to a plurality of display standards is stored by the decoder; wherein the decoder outputs, to the timing generator, timing information corresponding to the timing data, and wherein the timing generator outputs timing signals corresponding to the timing information and the control signal.” Chang et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 6, which depend from claim 1 are also patentable over Chang et al.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cites Chang et al. as allegedly teaching “a timing controller for latching and outputting the timing data inputted from the interface, and for generating and outputting timing signals for driving the liquid crystal display panel based on the control signal... wherein said timing controller includes a decoder (82, figure 8) and a timing

generator (42, figure 3), wherein timing generation information corresponding to a plurality of display standards is stored by the decoder (see resolution of VGA, SVGA, XGA of table 2), wherein the decoder outputs to the timing generator, timing information corresponding to the timing data, and wherein the timing generator outputs timing signals corresponding to the timing information and the control signal (see abstract).” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, items designated at reference numerals 42 and 82 of Figures 3 and 8, respectively, are not included within the same timing controller as implied by the Examiner in stating “wherein said timing controller includes a decoder (82, figure 8) and a timing generator (42, figure 3)”. It is respectfully submitted that the item designated at reference numeral 42 of Figure 3 in Chang et al. is a timing generator of a prior art device (see Chang et al., column 3, lines 13-14, lines 43-46; column 4, lines 16-19). However, the item designated at reference numeral 82 of Figure 8 in Chang et al. is a multi-level decoder of a multi-level input data driver (see Chang et al., column 3, lines 25-26, lines 43-46; column 4, lines 32-35). As set forth in M.P.E.P. § 2131, anticipation requires that “[t]he identical invention must be shown [in the reference] in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim.” Even if the entire disclosure of Chang et al. discloses each of the claim elements as individually set forth, such a disclosure exists only by piecing together isolated teachings of distinct embodiments (i.e., the device of the prior art and the device embodying the inventive concept of Chang et al.) Absent any suitable motivation to combine the conventional and inventive concepts of Chang et al., it is respectfully submitted that Chang et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, or suggest the presently claimed invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Moreover, that Chang et al. describes items designated at reference numerals 42 and 82 of Figures 3 and 8, respectively, using terms including “timing generator” and “decoder,” respectively,” does not justify a conclusion that Chang et al. anticipates the present invention. For example, at column 4, lines 16-19, Chang et al. describes Figure 3, stating “according to the prior art, a digital controller 40 comprises a timing generator 42 for generating N or 2N digital data outputs based on a N-bit digital data input.” At column 4, lines 32-35, Chang et al. describes Figure 8, stating “[a]ccording to the present invention... the multi-level data from FIG. 7 is inputted to a multi-level input data driver 80 and then is decoded by a multi-level decoder 82.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Chang et al. fails to teach, either expressly or

inherently, wherein the timing generator 42 "outputs timing signals corresponding to the timing information and the control signal," as asserted by the Examiner. Similarly, Applicant respectfully submits Chang et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, wherein the multi-level decoder 82 stores "timing generation information corresponding to a plurality of display standards... [and] outputs... timing information corresponding to the timing data [to the timing generator]," as asserted by the Examiner. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. in view of Barshinger is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 includes all of the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 3 is patentable over Chang et al. in view of Barshinger by virtue of its dependence from claim 1.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53,805
for Kurt M. Eaton
Registration No.: 51,640
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant

inherently, wherein the timing generator 42 "outputs timing signals corresponding to the timing information and the control signal," as asserted by the Examiner. Similarly, Applicant respectfully submits Chang et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, wherein the multi-level decoder 82 stores "timing generation information corresponding to a plurality of display standards... [and] outputs... timing information corresponding to the timing data [to the timing generator]," as asserted by the Examiner. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. in view of Barshinger is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 includes all of the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 3 is patentable over Chang et al. in view of Barshinger by virtue of its dependence from claim 1.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

for By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg No.} 53,005
Kurt M. Eaton
Registration No.: 51,640
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant